UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/679,320	10/04/2000	Herschel Clement Burstyn	SAR 13978	7581
58882 7590 01/25/2008 PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR			EXAMINER	
LOWENSTEIN	N SANDLER P.C.		SHAW, YIN CHEN	
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE ROSELAND, NJ 07068		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	09/679,320	BURSTYN, HERSCHEL CLEMENT			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Yin-Chen Shaw	2135			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 No.	ovember 2007.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-13,15-19 and 21-23</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13,15-19,21 and 22</u> is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 3-12, and 23</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	·			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

09/679,320 Art Unit: 2135

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This written action is responding to the amendment filed on 11/14/2007
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 13, 15, and 17 have been amended. Claims 2, 14, and 20 have been canceled. All other claims are as original.
- 3. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-19, and 21-23 have been examined and rejected.
- 4. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-19, and 21-23 are currently pending.
- 5. The Office would like to remind Applicant that there has been a change in Examiner in prosecuting the application. The rejection of the claims are based on the newly found reference by Takahara (US Patent 6,992,718) in combination with previously cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAdam, US patent 4,964,162 and further in view of Takahara US Patent 6,992,718.

Art Unit: 2135

Referring to claim 1, McAdam teaches a method for distorting a recording of projected images, comprising the steps of:

imposing modulated entities on video content of video source material, the modulated entities being incompatible With the video content [col. 3, line 61 through col. 4, line 6, i.e. in the video encode, line spin scrambling transforms applied to the video line or video line segment, see also col. 10, line 5, line spin transform encoder]; demodulating the modulated entities, wherein the demodulated entities are compatible with the video content [col. 4, lines 40-68, i.e. in then decoder applying the same line spin scrambling that was applied in the video encoder, see also col. 16, lines 5-30, the video decoder]; and

the unscrambled video signal output is converted into an analog video signal].

McAdam does not teach but Takahara teaches that the imposing modulated entities including separating the video content into selected colors and varying at least one of a plurality of parameters of at least one of the selected colors [col. 70, lines 50-52; col. 49, lines 50-52 from Takahara]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have McAdam combined with the teaching from Takahara for allowing a display image on the display panel to be enlargedly observed by the observer (Takahara, col. 2, lines 22-24).

Referring to claim 3, McAdam and Takahara teach the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one parameter is selected from the group comprising intensity, frequency, gain,

09/679,320

Art Unit: 2135

brightness, luminance, duty cycle, amplitude, and wavelength [col. 70, lines 50-52, i.e.

value of the color is regarded as the intensity from Takahara].

Referring to claim 4, McAdam and Takahara teach the method of claim 3 further

comprising the step of selecting a space for modulating the video content [col. 33, lines

2-3; col. 49, lines 45-49 from Takahara].

Referring to claim 5, McAdam and Takahara teach the method of claim 1 further

comprising the step of encoding modulation information corresponding to the modulated

entities, wherein the projecting step further includes the step of decoding the modulation

information [col. 4, lines 7-1, i.e. transform identifier indicating what particular

transforms have been applied to each video segment and inserted into the

horizontal blanking interval from McAdam].

Referring to claim 6, McAdam and Takahara teach the method of claim 4 wherein

imposing the modulated entities further includes the step of modulating the video in the

selected space [col. 33, lines 2-3; col. 49, lines 45-49 from Takahara].

Referring to claim 10, McAdam and Takahara teach the method of claim 1 wherein the

video source material comprises film [col. 1, lines 20-24, col. 2, lines 40-53 from

McAdam].

Application/Control Number:

09/679,320

Art Unit: 2135

Referring to claim 11, McAdam and Takahara teach the method of claim 5 wherein the video source material comprises film, the encoding step including storing the modulation information on the film [col. 4, lines 7-17, i.e. the encrypted transform identifier and

seed value are then inserted into the horizontal blanking interval of the line-spin

scrambled video signal, 9see also col. 57-67 from McAdam].

Referring to claim 12, McAdam and Takahara teach the method of claim 5 further

comprising the step of varying the modulation information with respect to the video

source material [column 2, col. 4, lines 7-17, col. 7, lines 60-67 i.e. a transform

identifier indicating What particular transforms have been applied to each video

line along with a seed value to synchronize with the similar one at the receiver

from McAdam].

Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAdam and

Takahara as applied to claim 1 and further in view of US 5,680,454 to Mead.

Referring to claim 23, McAdam and Takahara do not teach but Mead teaches

wherein the projecting step includes imposing a recording device dependent

interference on the projected video content [Mead, Abstract, col. 1, line 54 through

col. 2, line 6, wherein unauthorized duplication during a display of an image

sequence is prohibited by displaying an image sequence at a frame rate which is

Application/Control Number:

09/679,320

Art Unit: 2135

Page 6

varied for successive pairs of the image frames in dependence upon a pseudo-

random noise sequence]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have McAdam's encoder/decoder

to impose a recording device dependent interference as taught by Mead for displaying

the image sequence at a frame rate imperceptible by a human observer (Mead, col. 1,

lines 64-67).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13, 15-19 and 21-22 are allowed.

Claims 7-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments, filed on Nov. 14, 2007, have independent claims 1, 3, 13,

15, and 17 amended. The rejection of the claims are based on the newly found

reference by Takahara (US Patent 6,992,718) in combination with previously cited

references.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number:

09/679,320

Art Unit: 2135

Page 7

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Yin-Chen Shaw whose telephone number is 571272-

8593. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:15 to 4:15 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Yen Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YCS

Jan. 18, 2008

TOTAL STATE OF